

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/086,810	Applicant(s) SEKINO, MASANORI	
	Examiner ANH H DO	Art Unit 2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) ANH H DO. (3) _____
 (2) Eliot Malamud (4) _____

Date of Interview: 3/9/05

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed: Kadono

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

The Applicant's Representative pointed out that the claimed pixel value changing and error distributing sections are different from those in the cited prior art. Examiner indicated a close review should take place when officially receiving a response to the office action.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

W. M. M. M.
 Examiner's signature, if required